EXHIBIT D

08	08-017 8%:5919: 12 D 96- 05695-4 SRFil e 0004/07/17401Entqte0104/07/127 20:46:09-6 Æxhibit D ¹ Pg 2 of 3			
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
2		X		
3	SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION, IRVING H. PICARD, Plaintiffs,			
4				
5			12 MC 115 (JSR)	
6			12 MC 113 (USK)	
7	, ,			
8		Defendants.	Conference	
9		x		
10			New York, N.Y.	
11			October 12, 2012 4:40 p.m.	
12	Before:			
13		HON. JED S. RAKOFF		
14			District Judge	
15		ADDEADANGEG		
16	APPEARANCES			
17	NATHANAEL S. KELLEY Attorney for SIPC			
18				
19		& HOSTETLER LLC Attorneys for Trustee Picard		
20		OREN J. WARSHAVSKY LAN HOANG		
21	ANDERSON KILL & OLICK, P.C.			
22	BY:	Attorneys for Initial Transferees TODD E. DUFFY		
23	DENNIS J. NOLAN			
24	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Attorneys for Subsequent Transferees BY: CHRISTOPHER HARRIS		es	
25				

(Case called)

2.3

THE COURT: I'm going to try to keep this as short as possible because I don't think the economy can stand having to pay for all the lawyers in this room. This, unlike some of the issues that have come before the Court involving the Madoff matters, is one that the Court has previously dealt with.

Between that and the extensive briefing, I have reached some tentative conclusions, although I will make no final conclusions until I've heard oral argument and issued a written opinion.

My tentative conclusion is that the standard that the trustee must meet to establish lack of good faith under a willful blindness approach, as opposed to an actual intent approach, is that the defendant must subjectively believe that there is a high probability that a fact exists and the defendant must then consciously turn away or otherwise take a deliberate step or decision to avoid learning of that fact. Essentially, with a very slight massaging, the test set forth in Global-Tech Appliances v. SEB, 131 S.Ct. 2060, 2070, a 2011 decision of the Supreme Court.

I am also of the view that in an action brought under section 550, the burden is on the trustee to -- I'm sorry. I think I'm overstating where my head is at on the second thing. I'm not sure whether the burden of establishing good faith is on the defendant or the burden of establishing lack of good